PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D U 5 OCT 2005 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: PCT WIPO IRIT GORDON EITAN, PEARL, LATZER & COHEN-ZEDEK WRITTEN OPINION OF THE 7 SHENKAR STREET HERZLIA, ISRAEL 46725 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) OB OCT 2009 Date of mailing (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below P-6867-PC International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 17 June 2004 (17.06.2004) 20 June 2003 (20.06.2003) International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): A23C 9/20 and US Cl.: 426/585 Applicant NUTRINIA LTD 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Authorized office Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US

Pili A. Hawes

Telephone No. 571-272-1600

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Facsimile No. (571)273-8300

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE

International application No.
PCT/IL04/00532

	INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY	PCT/IL04/00532
Box N	o. I Basis of this opinion	
1. With	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the	e international application in the language in which it
was i	iled, unless otherwise indicated under this item. This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the or which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of interns	iginal language into the following language,
2. With inven	regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the int tion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:	***
a.	type of material a sequence listing table(s) related to the sequence listing	
b.	format of material in written format in computer readable form	
c.	time of filing/furnishing contained in international application as filed. filed together with the international application in computer readab furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.	ile form.
s. 🔲	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequapplication as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appr	ent or additional copies is identical to that in the
. Additi	onal comments:	

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE

International application No. PCT/IL04/00532

INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING	AUTHORI	LX .		
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement				
1. Statement				
Novelty (N)	Claims	12-15, 17-19, 51-52, 56, 71	YES	
		1-11, 16, 20-50, 53-55, 57-70, 72-87	NO	
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	NONE .	YES	
	Claims	1-87	NO	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims		YES	
	Claims	NONE	N0	
2. Citations and explanations:				
Please See Continuation Sheet				
•				

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL04/00532

Supplemental Box	
In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.	

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claims 1-11, 16, 20-50, 53-55, 57-70, 72-87 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by RUBIN US 5013569.

RUBN teaches a method of encapsulating bioactive materials such as immunoglobulites and omega-3 fatty acids and fortifying infinat formula with the composition. Various methods for micro encapsulation are disclosed, such as forming micelles in water-in-oil members are proposed to the product of the production of the production of the control of the production of the productin

Claims 1-87 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over RUBIN US 5013569 in view of PAUL US 5531989.
The limitations taught by RUBIN are discussed above.

PAUL teaches the same ingredients for the production of a concentrate that contains milk protein, immunoglobulins, fiber, and other feed/food grade materials. PAUL teaches the use of carbohydrates such as malhodextrin in the composition, and the source of immunoglobulin concentrate is formed by freeze-drying or spray drying methods. Paul teaches the composition can be reconstituted in water or other liquids. PAUL teaches in the incorporation of other bioactive compounds such as itsulin in the commosition.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to incorporate the multodextrin taught by PAUL in the microencapsulating process taught by RUBIN because PAUL teaches the same ingredients as RUBIN and also teaches a concentrate formulation. It would also be obvious to use freeze-drying and spray drying techniques in formation of the product because both RUBIN and PAUL teach this process.

Claims 1-87 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over the prior art as applied in the immediately preceding paragraph and further in view of JANDA et al. US 5418010.

JANDA further teaches that spray drying and extrusion are processes widely used by those of ordinary skill in the art for microencapsulating processes.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ these methods in forming microencapsulated particles for incorporation in infant formula because JANDA teaches that these processes are well known in the art. Also RUBIN discloses a variety of methods are. Form PCII/SA/237 (Supplemental Box) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL04/00532

Supplemental Box In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.			
possible for the preparation of microencapsulated particles.			
Claims 12-15, 17-19, 51-52, 56, 71 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2), because the prior art does not teach the exact imitations as set forth in the instant claims.			
Claims 1-87 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.			